

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

VIRTAMOVE, CORP., <div style="text-align: center;"><i>Plaintiff,</i></div> v. HEWLETT PACKARD ENTERPRISE COMPANY, <div style="text-align: center;"><i>Defendant.</i></div>	§ § § § § § § § § §	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:24-CV-00093-JRG (LEAD CASE)
---	--	---

VIRTAMOVE, CORP., <div style="text-align: center;"><i>Plaintiff,</i></div> v. INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP., <div style="text-align: center;"><i>Defendant.</i></div>	§ § § § § § § § § §	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:24-CV-00064-JRG (MEMBER CASE)
--	--	---

ORDER

Before the Court is the Joint Motion for Extension of Time to File Opposition and Reply to Motion to Transfer (Dkt. 87) (the “Motion for Extension”) filed by Plaintiff VirtaMove, Corp. and Defendant Hewlett Packard Enterprise (“Defendant” or “HPE”) (collectively, the “Parties”). (Dkt. No. 95.) In the Motion for Extension, the Parties request a one-week extension of time for Plaintiff to file its response to Defendant HPE’s Motion to Transfer Venue to the Northern District of California and a one-week extension for Defendant to file its reply in support of its motion to transfer. (*Id.*) Specifically, the Parties ask that Plaintiff’s deadline to file its response be extended to November 5, 2024, and Defendant’s deadline to reply in support of its motion to transfer be extended to November 19, 2024. (*Id.*)

Having considered the Motion for Extension, and noting its joint nature, the Court finds that it should be and hereby is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's deadline to file its response be **extended** up to and including **November 5, 2024**, and Defendant's deadline to reply in support of its motion to transfer be **extended** up to and including **November 19, 2024**.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 29th day of October, 2024.



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE